





City of Loma Linda Official Report

Floyd Petersen, Mayor
Stan Brauer, Mayor pro tempore
Robert Christman, Councilmember
Robert Ziprick, Councilmember
Charles Umeda, Councilmember

COUNCIL AGENDA: April 18, 2006

TO: City Council

VIA: Dennis R. Hallaway, City Manager 

FROM: Deborah Woldruff, AICP, Community Development Director 

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF THE COMMITTEE COMMENTS FROM THE
MARCH 12, 2006 JOINT WORKSHOP ON ALTERNATIVES
FOR THE SOUTH HILLS DESIGNATION

RECOMMENDATION

The recommendation is for the City Council to accept and file the Report and Summary Matrix, and direct staff to revise the Draft General Plan (October 2005) to reflect the general consensus of the March 12, 2006 workshop participants.

BACKGROUND

On March 12, 2006, the Planning Commission, Historical Commission, Parks, Recreation and Beautification Committee, Trails Development Committee, Traffic Advisory Committee, Budget Committee, and Senior Center Board met in a joint workshop to review the three Alternatives for the South Hills Designation. The committee members were asked to step outside of the purview of their individual committees and provide input as trusted members of the community.

The three Alternatives in question are listed below:

- Draft South Hills Designation (Draft General Plan, October 2005)
- Alternative 1 (Proposed Initiative prepared by Save Loma Linda)
- Alternative 2 (Proposal for the South Hills Designation prepared by Elssmann/Zirkle/Snell)

The Workshop participants were divided into four groups that were tasked with completing a form entitled "What Would You like to See in the South Hills Area?". One form was completed per group as a group effort. The form for each group was presented at end of the workshop. Staff committed to organizing the basic consensus information from the group forms into a summary matrix. A copy of the Summary Matrix is available in Attachment A. Staff also consolidated the verbatim comments from the group forms into a second matrix that is contained in Attachment B (Group Comments Matrix).

ANALYSIS

Staff reviewed the workshop information and initially prepared the Group Comments Matrix verbatim from the four Group Forms. That matrix was used to identify commonalities among the responses, which were then used to prepare the Summary Matrix. The following is a discussion of the commonalities and differences that were found in the Group Forms (by topic):

1. Allowable Land Use – The consensus of all four groups is for single-family residential and limited trails and open space uses. Trails uses include hiking, walking, running, bicycling, and equestrian uses with motorized vehicles (i.e., dirt bikes, ATVs, and other off-road vehicles) prohibited.
2. Allowable Densities – The groups differ somewhat regarding allowable densities. Groups 1 and 3 seem to be in accord with 0.0 to 2.0 dwelling units per acre and minimum lot sizes of 0.5-acres with clustering. Group 2 is in favor of relying on the Draft General Plan density cap of 1, 185 units and Group 4 calls for a range of 1,185 to 1,250 units. These responses basically call for very low densities with minimum half acre lots or greater. The half acre lot size is acceptable with clustering.
3. Dwelling Unit Cap – Of the four groups, Group 1 calls for the most conservative dwelling unit cap at a maximum of 575 to 600 units. Groups 2 through 4 are very close with the cap ranging from 1,000 to 1,250 units. It appears that the cap applies to the entire South Hills Area including the Sphere of Influence south and east of Beaumont Avenue, bench area south and adjacent to Beaumont Avenue, and Scotch Lane area. Group 4's response includes Prado Lane, which is located in the City of Colton.
4. Density Transfers – Groups 1 and 4 appear to be in accord and would allow density transfers within the Targeted Open Space area identified on the Trails Development Committee's map and Draft General Plan requirements. Group 3 calls for up to 4.0 units per acre and Group 2 feels that the issue is too complex to address in a three hour workshop.
5. Density Bonuses – Groups 2 through 4 refer to their responses to Item No. 4 while Group 1 calls for a maximum density transfer of 2.0 units per acre.
6. Grading Limitations – All four groups are in accord that grading activities in the South Hills Area should be limited. Groups 2 through 4 all call for landform grading with Group 2 specifying that minimum grading should occur on north facing slopes. In the Group Comments Matrix, Group 3 stipulates the importance of preserving the intent to cluster where mass grading may be necessary for development as approved by the City Council.
7. Access and Circulation – All four groups agree that there should be no through roads in the South Hills. Group 1 stipulates that the 360-foot street standard should be used for public safety reasons. Group 2 identifies that the only roads allowed should be San Timoteo Canyon Road, Reche Canyon Road, and Whittier Street. Groups 2 through 4 all mention that the existing trails should remain. The Group Comments Matrix includes some additional comments related public access to trail heads, viewpoint areas for the physically challenged, vehicle turnouts, and consideration access for emergency vehicles.

8. Utility and Infrastructure – Group 1 calls for the placement of utilities and infrastructure below grade. Groups 2 through 4 indicate that development should conform to City requirements, with the added comment from Group 3 that septic systems should be allowed where necessary.
9. Open Space – The four groups identify this issue as key and are very much in accord that open space should be maximized and set aside in perpetuity. Other comments call for a future environmental report to assist in identifying potential open space, clustering of development as a way to maximize open space, and limiting of recreational uses in open space areas.
10. Trails and Other Recreational Uses – As indicated in Issue No. 1, the groups feel that hiking, (including running and walking), bicycling, and equestrian uses are appropriate in the South Hills. Other recreational uses mentioned by some of the groups include a golf course, and archery range. Group 3 commented that the trails should remain largely unimproved and all feel that motorized vehicles should be prohibited. Group 4 feels that the allowable trail and recreational uses should be based on studies that are currently being conducted. Staff is assuming that this comment refers to the studies that have been conducted for the General Plan Update Project.
11. Ridgeline and Valley Protections – The groups all are concerned about the preservation of ridgelines. Group 2 specifies that there should be no visible development or minimal development on north facing slopes. Group 3 calls for no structural projects above ridgelines and Group 4 calls for development to be limited to the south side of ridgelines, below sight.
12. View-shed Protections – Similar to Issue 11, the groups feel that view-sheds should be protected. Group 1 goes so far as to comment that view-sheds should be preserved in perpetuity. Group 2 feels that no structures should be visible from San Timoteo Canyon and Barton Roads and Group 3 is in agreement with the limitation to views from Barton Road. Group 4 defers to the Draft General Plan requirements.
13. Biological Resources – All four groups feel that biological resources in the South Hills should be preserved. Other comments relate to the need for a survey and the development of a resource management plan, continuous blocks of open space presumably to accommodate migration patterns and habitat contiguity and continuity, and coordination with other nearby jurisdictions to ensure and safeguard continuous open space, habitat, and migration patterns.
14. Public Safety – The four group's comments reflect their concerns that any further development in the South Hills should be carefully considered in light of public safety (i.e., natural disasters, easy access for quick response times and evacuation).
15. Other Considerations (and General Comments) – These comments are not included on the Summary Matrix but are on the Group Comments Matrix. The comments reflect a general concern for public safety, preservation of natural resources (particularly Scott Canyon), water and sewer demand and impacts to other City services, and the nature of commercial recreational uses that might be allowed.

The March 12, 2006 workshop was instrumental in providing staff and the consultant with more current information regarding the community's vision for the future of the South Hills. It appears

that the community (as represented by the committee members who participated in the workshop) and the City are very close in their views on this topic.

ENVIRONMENTAL

Conducting the March 12th workshop on the three alternatives for the South Hills and reporting the consensus findings of the four groups is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines §15306, *Information Collection*. The Class 6 Categorical Exemption covers basic data collection, information gathering, and similar activities that will not result in significant impacts to the environment or serious or major disturbance to an environmental resource. If any of the consensus information is incorporated into the Draft General Plan, that effect on the document and its internal consistency, and potential effects resulting from implementation of the Draft General Plan will be evaluated to ensure that the changes fall within the scope of the Draft Final EIR. This evaluation would of necessity occur prior to certification of the Draft Final EIR and adoption of the General Plan.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

The costs associated with the March 12, 2006 workshop are less than \$100 for paper supplies and refreshments. These costs are independent from costs incurred by staff in the preparation and attendance of the workshop. The consensus information gleaned from the workshop will be used to make final revisions to the Draft General Plan and as such, are absorbed into the costs for the General Plan Update Project.

ATTACHMENTS

- A. Summary Matrix
- B. Group Comments Matrix
- C. Form (What Would You Like To See In The South Hills Area?)

I:\General Plan Update\Staff Reports\CC\CC 04-18-06sr Matrix.doc

ATTACHMENT A

SUMMARY MATRIX

South Hills Workshop
March 12, 2006
SUMMARY MATRIX

	A	B	C	D	E
1	Hillside Land Use Characteristics	Group No. 1	Group No. 2	Group No. 3	Group No. 4
2					
3	1. Allowable Land Uses	Single-Family Residential Limited Trail/Open Space Uses	Single-Family Residential Limited Trail/Open Space Uses	Single-Family Residential Limited Trail/Open Space Uses	Single-Family Residential Limited Trail/Open Space Uses
4	2. Allowable Densities	Minimum 0.5-Acre Lots (with Clustering); Encourage 0.75 and 1.0-Acre Lots	Density Cap as per Draft General Plan	Maximum 0 to 2.0 Dwelling Units/Acre; Clustered 0.5-Acre Minimum Lot Size	Range from 1,185 to 1,250
5	3. Dwelling Unit Cap	Maximum 575 to 600 Units	Maximum 1,185 Units	Maximum 1,000 Units (South Hills/Bench Area)	Maximum 1,250 Units (including Scotch Lane)
6	4. Density Transfers	Allowed (with Targeted Open Space Map conformance)	Too Complex for Workshop	Up To 4.0 Units per acre	Subject to Proposed General Plan requirements
7	5. Density Bonuses	Max Transfer of 2.0 per acre	See Item 4 (above)	See Item 4 (above)	See Item 4 (above)
8	6. Grading Limitations	Minimal Grading (as per Draft General Plan)	Landform Grading; Minimum Grading on North Facing Slopes	Landform Grading (as per Draft General Plan)	Landform Grading (as per Draft General Plan)
9	7. Access and Circulation	Minimum 36-Foot Street Standard (for safety); No Through Roads	San Timoteo Canyon, Reche Canyon, Whittier Street, and no others; trails	No through roads; Improvements existing roads	Accessible trail heads and viewpoint areas; emergency vehicle turnouts
10	8. Utility and Infrastructure	All required below grade	As per City requirements	As per City requirements	As per City requirements
11	9. Open Space	Targeted public open space dedicated into perpetuity	Maximize open space - guaranteed, irrevocable	Large wilderness area locked in perpetuity	Maximize permanent open space
12	10. Trails and Other Recreational Uses	Hiking, bicycling, equestrian uses; unimproved trails	Hiking, bicycling, equestrian uses; unimproved trails	Hiking, bicycling, equestrian uses; unimproved trails	Based on studies of current uses
13	11. Ridgeline and Valley Protections	Preserve ridgelines/valley floors, habitat (plant/animal)	No visible development; minimal on north facing slopes	Preserve major ridgelines; no structural projections	Development on southside of and below ridgeline sights.
14	12. View-shed Protections	Viewshed preserved in perpetuity	No structures visible from San Timoteo Canyon/Barton Roads	No Structures to be Seen From Barton Road	As per Draft General Plan
15	13. Biological Resources	Need survey for resource management plan	Preserve existing indigenous vegetation, as possible	Preserve continuous blocks of wilderness area	Preserve habitat and open space
16	14. Public Safety	No Further Development of Homes that are unprotected	Per City requirements (response time \leq 5 Minutes)	Clustering for ease of access for Fire, Police, etc.	Roads designed for quick access to developed areas

GROUP COMMENTS MATRIX

South Hills Workshop
(03-12-06)
GROUP COMMENTS MATRIX

	A	B	C	D	E
1	Hillside Land Use Characteristics	Group No. 1	Group No. 2	Group No. 3	Group No. 4
2					
3	1. Allowable Land Uses	Single-Family Residential Housing, Hiking, Biking & Equestrian Trail uses	Maximize Open Space; Single-Family Residential and Community Uses	A. Residential - Churches, Homes, Golf Course; B. Open Spaces - Wilderness, Limited Recreation	Residential, Trails, Commercial Recreational, Habitat Conservation, Public Recreation
4	2. Allowable Densities	Minimum 0.5-Acre Lots (even after cluster bonuses are applied), and Encourage 0.75 and 1.0-Acre Lots	Density Cap (as per City Plan)	Maximum Units - 0 to 2.0 Dwelling Units (du)/Acre; Clustered 0.5 Acre Minimum Lot Size	As per 3 Alternatives - Range from Minimum of 1,185 to Maximum of 1,250
5	3. Dwelling Unit Cap	575 to 600 Units Total	1,185 (as per 3 alternatives)	1,000 du Clustered in South Hills/Bench Area	Variable - up to 1,250 (including Prado and Scotch Lanes)
6	4. Density Transfers	Allowed (with Targeted Open Space Map conformance)	Too Complex to Figure Out with Time Constraint	Up To 4.0 du/Acre	Yes - Subject to Proposed General Plan
7	5. Density Bonuses	Max Transfer Bonus - 2.0	See Item 4 (above)	See Item 4 (above)	Yes - Per City Plan
8	6. Grading Limitations	Minimize Grading by Clustering to Conform with Draft General Plan	Landform Grading; Minimum Grading - North Facing Slopes	A. Limit to Landform Grading: No Grading in Open Spaces; B. Preserve Intent to Cluster Where Mass Grading may be Necessary for Development as Approved by City Council	Per City Plan
9	7. Access and Circulation	36 Foot Street Standard (for safety), and No Through Roads	Existing Trails; San Timoteo Canyon; Reche Canyon; Whittier Street; No Others	A. No Roads Through Wilderness; Trailheads, Parking Unmaintained; B. Access to Developed Areas - Improvements to Beaumont Street, San Timoteo Road and Other Off-site Improvements	A. Public Access to trail head/viewpoint areas for physically challenged; B. turnouts and emergency vehicle access consideration; C. developments per City plan
10	8. Utility and Infrastructure	Require Below Grade - All Open Space - Featured Part of the General Plan; Environmental Report needed to Identify Targeted Open Space; Dedicated into Perpetuity; Open to Public	Conform to City Requirements	Septic Systems Where Necessary	As required for development
11	9. Open Space	Refer to Item 1 (above); Other Uses (Archery, Sports, etc.) Must Fit into Resource Plan	Definite Amount (Maximum) Open Space - Guaranteed and Irrevocable	Locked in Perpetuity - Large Wilderness, Limited Recreational Spaces	Maximize permanent open space with clustering through private owner & City agreements in perpetuity as the optimal goal
12	10. Trails and Other Recreational Uses	Refer to Item 1 (above); Other Uses (Archery, Sports, etc.) Must Fit into Resource Plan	Hiking, Running, Walking, Equestrian; No Motorized Uses	Unimproved Trails - Hiking, Bicycling, Equestrian; No Motorized Vehicles	Based on studies currently conducted regarding current uses

South Hills Workshop
(03-12-06)
GROUP COMMENTS MATRIX

	A	B	C	D	E
		Ridgelines Preserved; Canyon Bottoms Preserved (habitat - plants, animals)	No Visible Development; and Minimal on North Facing Slopes Barton Road	No Building on Major Ridgelines; Structures No Taller than can be Seen From Barton Road	Yes - Development to be on southside of and below ridgeline sights.
13	11. Ridgeline and Valley Protections				
		Vital Part of Nature and Character of City; Preserved in Perpetuity (all three plans)	No Visible Structures From San Timoteo Canyon And Barton Roads	No Structures to be Seen From Barton Road	Yes - Per City Plan
14	12. View-shed Protections			Continuous Blocks of Wilderness Area to Connect with Neighboring Cities; Emerald Belt, Habitat Preservation	With a view towards what neighboring area are doing and with balance of other open space uses
		Survey Needed for Resource Management Plan	Preserve Existing Indigenous Vegetation, as Possible		
15	13. Biological Resources		Per City Requirements/Fire Code Article 86 (Response Time not to Exceed 5 Minutes)	Emergencies; Encourage Clustering for Ease of Access for Fire, Police, etc.	Roads to be constructed for quick access to developed areas
		No Further Development of Homes that are Unprotected			
16	14. Public Safety	1. Development will increase demand for water/sewer services; 2. additional irrigated areas can increase pollution in aquifer; 3. Introduction of non-native species into wildland areas can compromise communities of native plants; landscaping in new areas should include native plantings, xeriscaping and restoration of native plants to open space; 4. Water tanks underground; 5. Resist pressure to act in haste; City Council should be free to deliberate on this most important issue.			
			Irrevocably Preserve Scott's Canyon (in its Entirety) Against Development Other Than Trails	Low Fire Foliage, Drought Resistant Plants; No Invasive Species; Less Lawn space; Water Reservoirs - Printed to Blend with Environment (if not underground)	Concerned that the provision in Alternative 2, Item K. not be implemented. Any commercial recreational use is to be developed on private property and not on City owned land.
17	15. Other Considerations	1. Prohibit Motorcycles, ATVs, and Golf Courses; 6. Require Engineering Study Standards for Projects			
18	General Comments	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

ATTACHMENT C

FORM
(WHAT WOULD YOU LIKE TO SEE IN THE
SOUTH HILLS AREA?)

WHAT WOULD YOU LIKE TO SEE IN THE SOUTH HILLS AREA?

Prepared by Group Number _____

1. Allowable Land Uses _____

2. Allowable Densities _____

3. Dwelling Unit Cap _____
4. Density Transfers _____

5. Density Bonuses _____

6. Grading Limitations _____

7. Access and Circulation _____

8. Utility and Infrastructure _____

9. Open Space _____

10. Trails and Other Recreational Uses _____

11. Ridgeline and Valley Protections _____

12. View-shed Protections_____

13. Biological Resources_____

14. Public Safety_____

15. Other Considerations_____
